

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation and apparently unlawful.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter. Shouldn't the above mean that it should attempt to provide an unbiased source of media coverage and wouldn't this seem to be in direct contradiction to what other officials were claiming that National Public Radio was leaning too far left to be aired on public airwaves?

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.

Teigen Leonard
Attorney at Law